



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/636,108	08/10/2000	Erik M. Theisen	GLNPIN114873	6358

7590

04/15/2003

CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS PLLC  
Suite 2800  
1420 Fifth Avenue  
Seattle, WA 98101

EXAMINER

CHOW, MING

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2645

DATE MAILED: 04/15/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/636,108

Applicant(s)

THEISEN ET AL.

Examiner

Ming Chow

Art Unit

2645

10

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 February 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 8/10/00 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other:

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

1. Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 11, 14-16, 17-19, 21, 23, 27, 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Greco et al (US: 5568540).

For claims 1 and 17, regarding section (a), Greco et al teach on item 157 Fig. 3 rewind a few seconds. The “rewind a few seconds” of Greco et al is the claimed “repositioning”. It is inherent that repositioning begins upon receipt of a command (item 157 is selected). Greco et al also teach on column 5 line 31-35 the mail message may be listened to on the telephone. Greco et al further teach on Fig. 5 and column 6 line 66 to column 7 line 1-10 an interface between the

Art Unit: 2645

telephone and the computer. It is inherent that the “start” command can be communicated from the telephone

Regarding section (b), Greco et al teach on column 5 line 51 a slider graphically shows the present position within that length. The “slider graphically shows the present position” of Greco et al is the claimed “feedback”. The “slider” of Greco et al is the claimed “supervisory signal”.

Regarding section (c), Greco et al teach on item 155 Fig. 3 stop. Regarding “the stop command.....message system”, same rejections as stated in section (a) above apply.

Regarding claims 2 and 18, Greco et al teach on item 157 Fig. 3 “digital command” (window-based command selection).

Regarding claims 3 and 19, Greco et al teach on item 155 Fig. 3 “digital command” (window-based command selection).

Regarding claims 5 and 21, Greco et al teach on items 148 and 149 Fig. 3 “a visual signal”.

Regarding claims 7 and 23, Greco et al teach on column 6 line 31 the user must play back the message and stop it at the desired point to know how the slider position corresponds with an interval between words within a message. It is inherent that the slider must reposition (on a computer) operates at fixed intervals (in terms of number of bits or bytes).

Art Unit: 2645

Regarding claims 11 and 27, Greco et al teach on item 159 Fig. 3 “forward to the end”. The “forward to the end” of Greco et al is the claimed “fast-forwarding”.

Regarding claims 14 and 30, Greco et al teaches on item 156 Fig. 3 “rewind to the beginning”.

Regarding claims 15 and 31, it is inherent that Greco’s system must stop the repositioning at the beginning of the message. Greco et al also teach on items 152, 150, and 151 of Fig. 3. “From”, “To”, “Subject”, and “Sent”. The “From”, “To”, “Subject”, and “Sent” are the contents of the message envelope. The message envelope is displayed (the claimed “playing”) when the message is rewinding and before the beginning (the claimed playing the message) of message is reached.

Regarding claims 16 and 32, Greco et al teach on item 148 Fig.3 “a slider”. The “slider” of Greco et al is the claimed (visual) signal. When the slider reaches the beginning (the left most position of item 149 Fig. 3 bar graph) it provides a signal that the beginning of the message has been reached.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2645

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 4 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greco et al as applied to claim 1 above, and in view of Knuth et al (US-PAT-NO: 5,406,618). Greco et al failed to teach the supervisory signal is an aural signal. However, Knuth et al teach on column 4 line 39 "I will play your messages". The "I will play your messages" of Knuth et al is the claimed aural signal. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Greco et al to have the supervisory signal is an aural signal as taught by Knuth et al such that the modified system of Greco et al would be able to support the aural signal to the system users.

3. Claims 6 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greco et al as applied to claim 1 above, and in view of Carson (US-PAT-NO: 6,232,887). Greco et al failed to teach the supervisory signal is a vibratory signal. However, Carson teaches on column 9 line 4 a vibrating signal. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Greco et al to have the supervisory signal is a vibratory signal as taught by Carson such that the modified system of Greco et al would be able to support the vibratory signal to the system users.

4. Claims 8-10, 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greco et al as applied to claim 1 above, and in view of Larson et al (US: 6408068).

Art Unit: 2645

Regarding claims 8 and 24, Greco et al failed to teach “supervisory signal operates at variable intervals”. However, Larson et al teach on column 6 line 52-65 variable flash rate (claimed “signal operates at variable intervals”) to indicate operation (column 6 line 54) of a voice message system (Fig. 14). It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Greco et al to have the supervisory signal operates at variable intervals as taught by Larson et al such that the modified system of Greco et al would be able to support the variable intervals to the system users.

Regarding claims 9 and 25, Greco et al teach on item 156 Fig 3 “rewind to the beginning”. The “rewind to the beginning” of Greco et al reads on the claimed “based on the length of the voice message”.

Regarding claims 10 and 26, Greco et al teach on column 6 line 31 the user must play back the message and stop it at the desired point to know how the slider position corresponds with an interval between words within a message. The “desired point” of Greco et al reads on the claimed “based on the position of the voice message”.

5. Claims 12 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greco et al as applied to claim 11 above, and in view of Fielder (US-PAT-NO: 5,845,240). Regarding the steps of stopping the repositioning substantially at the end of the message. The Greco’s system must stop at the end of the message. Greco et al failed to teach playing a portion of the message substantially preceding the end. However, Fielder teaches on column 8 line 32 “plays

Art Unit: 2645

fast-forward through the current block”. The “plays” of Fielder reads on the claimed “playing a portion”. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Greco et al and Robinson et al to have the playing a portion of the message substantially preceding the end as taught by Fielder such that the modified system of Greco et al would be able to support the playing a portion of the message to the system users.

6. Claims 13 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greco et al, and Fielder et al as applied to claim 12 above, and in view of Ireton (US-PAT-NO: 5,970,447). Greco et al, and Fielder et al failed to teach the steps of providing a signal that the end of the message has been reached. However, Ireton teaches on column 1 line 21 “end of message signal”. The “end of message signal” of Ireton reads on the claimed “providing a signal that the end of the message has been reached”. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Greco et al, and Fielder to have the providing a signal that the end of the message has been reached as taught by Ireton such that the modified system of Greco, and Fielder would be able to support the signal to the system users.

### ***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments filed on 2/11/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.



Art Unit: 2645

- Applicant argues, on page 5-6, regarding the amended limitation of “start (and stop) command is communicated from a telephone to the voice message system. However, Greco teaches on Fig. 5, column 5 line 31-35, and column 6 line 66 to column 7 line 10 the user may listen to the message via the telephone which has an interface to the computer. It is inherent that the “start” and “stop” commands must be communicated from the telephone.
- Applicant argues, on page 7, regarding supervisory signal operates at variable intervals based on message length and position in the message. A new prior art is cited for rejection.

### *Conclusion*

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

Art Unit: 2645

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this application and office action should be directed to the examiner Ming Chow whose telephone number is (703) 305-4817. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 am to 5 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang, can be reached on (703) 305-4895. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Customer Service whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

**Washington, D.C. 20231**

**Or faxed to TC2600's Customer Service FAX Number 703-872-9314.**

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2645

Ming Chow



*Allan Hoosain*  
ALLAN HOOSAIN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
*for*  
*Fan Tsang*